



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,047	07/10/2006	Wilhelmus Josephus Herman Jan Bronnenberg	NLO40009	5252
24737	7590	10/15/2008		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS				
P.O. BOX 3001				
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
JOHN, BAGVAN CLARENCE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2443				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/15/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/597,047

**Applicant(s)**

BRONNENBERG ET AL.

**Examiner**

B. CLARENCE JOHN

**Art Unit**

4121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/10/2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

Claims 1 and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 1 and 11 recite ... storing "said filtered information" in a content directory and making "said stored information" available on the network.

The above phrase in the claims should be corrected to read "said information filtered"

and "said information stored" respectively. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault et al. (US 6,049,821) in view of Hughes et al. (US 6,065,055).

With respect to Claim 1, Theriault teaches a method of filtering and storing information about content, which is available on a network device in a network, wherein said network further comprises network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the method comprises the steps of: -

filtering said information by removing information about content (Page 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17); which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for rendering content, (Here, response cannot be rendered because of the filtering service selected by the user); storing said filtered information in a content directory and making said stored information available on the network. (Page 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

Therault does not teach periodically filtering the said information.

However, Hughes teaches such a limitation. (Page 3, lines 38-40, lines 65-67, Page 5, lines 10-12, Page 10, lines 16,17. From Figure 10, the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Therault and Hughes by modifying the teaching of Therault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

With respect to Claim 5, Therault teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said method of filtering and storing information about content is performed.

However, Theriault does not teach filtering and storing information of content "in predefined time intervals".

Hughes teaches such a limitation. (Figure 10, Scan Interval, Page 5, lines 10-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes for the same reason as Claim 1 above.

With respect to Claim 6, Theriault teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said method of filtering and storing information about content is performed when a new network rendering device enters the network. (Page 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17. Page 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. Here, the user device selecting the filtering services is the new device entering the network).

Deleted:

With respect to Claim 10, Theriault teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the method further comprises storing said removed information about content, (Page 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58, That is, storing of the modified response (i.e., removed information) in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for rendering content (Page 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17); and making said stored information available on the network. (Page 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

With respect to Claim 11, Theriault teaches a filtering device adapted for filtering and storing information about content, which is available on a network device in a network, wherein said network further comprises network rendering devices adapted for rendering content, the network device further comprises:

means for filtering said information by removing information about content, (Page 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17);

which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for rendering content, (Here, response cannot be rendered because of the filtering service selected by the user);

means for storing said filtered information in a content directory and making said stored information available on the network. (Page 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

Theriault does not teach periodically filtering the said information.

However, Hughes teaches such a limitation. (Page 3, lines 38-40, lines 65-67, Page 5, lines 10-12, Page 10, lines 16,17. From Figure 10, the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by modifying the teaching of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault in view of Hughes in further view of Abdulrahiman et al. (US 2003/0023671)

With respect to Claim 2, Theriault in view of Hughes teaches all limitations of Claim 1. .  
Theriault also teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein content, which cannot be rendered by a network rendering device comprises content having a content format. (Page 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17; Here, response cannot be rendered because of the filtering service selected by the user)

However Theriault and Hughes do not teach the content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices.

Abdulrahiman does teach such a limitation. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21, Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault, Hughes and Abdulrahiman by modifying the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

With respect to Claim 3, Theriault in view of Hughes teaches all limitations of Claim 1. Theriault also teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein content, which cannot be rendered by a network rendering device comprises content. ( Page 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17; Here, response cannot be rendered because of the filtering service selected by the user);

However, Theriault and Hughes do not teach a content having a transport protocol, which is not compatible with the network rendering devices.



Abdulrahiman does teach such a limitation. (Page 3, paragraph [0030], lines 6-11, Paragraph [0031], lines 5-8. That is, electronic information transmitted between remote source and proxy via wireless / wire connection must have a transport protocol).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault, Hughes and Abdulrahiman by modifying the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to the destination by following certain supported data formats.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault in view of Hughes in further view of Safadi (US 2003/0126086).

With respect to Claim 4, Theriault and Hughes teach all limitations of Claim 1.

However, Theriault and Hughes do not teach a method according to claim 1, wherein a content having a DRM system, which is not supported by any of the network rendering devices.

Safadi does teach such a limitation. (Page 2, paragraph [0021], lines 1-2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault, Hughes and Safadi by modifying the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to interface with multiple content providers and provide copy protection of content.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault in view of Hughes in further view of Gorman (US 2002/0143780).

With respect to Claim 7, Theriault in view of Hughes teaches all limitations of Claim 1. Theriault also teaches a method of filtering (Page 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17); and storing information about content is performed (Page 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

However, Theriault and Hughes do not teach a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network.

Gorman does teach such a limitation. ( Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault, Hughes and Gorman by modifying the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

With respect to Claim 8, Theriault and Hughes teach all limitations of Claim 1. Theriault and Hughes teach a method of filtering (See Theriault, Page 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17); and storing information about content is performed (See Theriault, Page 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58) for a predefined time interval (See Hughes, Figure 10, Scan Interval, Page 5, lines 10-12).

However Theriault and Hughes do not teach filtering is performed when a network device has been removed.

Gorman does teach such a limitation. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault, Hughes and

Gorman by modifying the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault in view of Hughes in further view of Cheng (US 2002/0078161).

With respect to Claim 9, Theriault and Hughes teach all limitations of Claim 1. Theriault also teaches the information about content being available on a network device is the content information stored by the content directory service. (Page 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

However, Theriault and Hughes do not teach wherein the network is a UPnP network.

Cheng does teach such a limitation. (Page 2, paragraph [0018], lines 1-5. Figure 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault, Hughes and Cheng by modifying the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by employing a UPnP network which is self configuring and has the network controller which is capable of discovering and controlling other devices.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to B. CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is (571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Weekdays from 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM, Monday - Thursday and Alternate Fridays, from 7:30AM-4:00 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Robertson can be reached on (571)272-4186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BCJ/  
Examiner  
10/6/2008

/Philip C Lee/  
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2452